

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 8-10, 15-17, and 22-42 are pending in this application. Claims 1-3, 8-10, 15-17, and 22-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. patent 4,760,606 to Lesnick et al. (herein “Lesnick”) in view of U.S. patent 5,666,490 to Gillings et al. (herein “Gillings”).

Addressing the above-noted rejection, that rejection is traversed by the present response.

Initially, applicants note the claims are amended by the present response to delete certain limitations and to clarify other limitations. Specifically, the claims now clarify the storing of “registered group names and corresponding user names for each respective group name”. The claims also clarify that when the first sheet of format image information indicates a “group name, a controller determines if the group name is registered, and if the group name is registered the image information server stores the sheet document image information in an applicable folder or file of each registered user corresponding to the group name”, or similar language. That subject matter is fully supported by the original specification for example in Figures 5 and 6 and the discussion in the present specification at page 9, line 15 to page 12, line 6.

In view of the features set forth in the claims, the claimed system and method will store group name and corresponding users such as shown in Figure 6. A sheet of input format image information can indicate a group name, and then it is determined if the group name is registered, see for example Step 14 in Figure 5. If the group name is registered the ensuing image information is stored in folders of each user in the group, see for example Step 15 - Step 17 in Figure 5 in the present specification and the discussion at page 11, lines 14-22.

With such a claimed operation the present invention makes it possible for electronic documents to be more easily accessed by corresponding users, and thus storage of an electronic document can be efficiently performed.

The above-noted features clarified in the claims are believed to clearly distinguish over the applied art.

One basis for the previous rejection cites Gillings to disclose distributing documents based on work group names used to index the documents, the outstanding Office Action citing Gillings at column 6, line 46 to column 7, line 16, and also citing Gillings to teach overcoming the efficiency of letting only one user at a time access case reports, citing Gillings at column 1, line 52 to column 2, line 3.<sup>1</sup>

In response to that basis for the outstanding rejection, applicants submit Gillings does not disclose or suggest the currently claimed features. Specifically, Gillings first does not disclose or suggest that group names and corresponding user names for each respective group name are initially registered, and that it is determined whether a sheet of format image information indicates a group name and whether the group name is registered.

The citation of Gillings at column 6, line 46 to column 7, line 16 merely indicates functions corresponding to different work groups. Gillings discloses that users assigned in work groups can access items in a given workflow cue.<sup>2</sup>

However, the claims have a different operation. Specifically, in the claims a determination is made if a group name is registered, and if the group name is registered then an appropriate document is stored in an applicable folder of each registered user corresponding to the group. Thus, the claimed invention requires an affirmative operation of

---

<sup>1</sup> Office Action of March 2, 2006, the paragraph bridging pages 7 and 8.

<sup>2</sup> Gillings at column 7, lines 2-4.

storing document information into an appropriate user folder for only a user of a registered group, rather than merely setting access conditions for users as in Gillings.

In such ways, the disclosure at Gillings at column 6, line 46 to column 7, line 16 does not meet the limitations now recited in each of the independent claims.

Also, with respect to the citation of Gillings at column 1, line 52 to column 2, line 3, Gillings merely discloses allowing multiple access to a case report. That disclosure in Gillings is not all related to the claimed features in which group names and corresponding user names are initially registered, and that if after a first sheet of image information indicates a group name, a controller determines if the group name is registered, and if the group name is registered corresponding image information is stored to a folder for each registered user corresponding to the group name.

In such ways, no teachings in Gillings correspond to the claimed features.

Moreover, no teachings in Lesnick were cited with respect to the above-noted features, nor are any teachings in Lesnick believed to disclose or suggest the above-noted features clarified in the claims.

Thereby, the claims as currently written are believed to distinguish over Lesnick in view of Gillings. Thus, the claims as currently written are believed to be allowable.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)

GJM:SNS\dt

I:\ATTY\SNS\0557\05574696\05574696.AM2.DOC

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Gregory J. Maier  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 25,599

Surinder Sachar  
Registration No. 34,423